

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The office action of March 3, 2003 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Claim 1 is objected to for the misspelling of linear. Claim 1 has been amended and no longer recites the term.

Claim 1, as amended, requires that wall segments of adjacent cavities share a common drive element and that the drive element resides substantially in the space in between adjacent cavities. This feature is shown in figures 1 and 2, in particular items 9, 10, and 11. This feature is also inferred from page 5, line 10-13:

It will of course be apparent that a form of drive must be chosen which fits into the limited space available.

This limited space is discussed at page 2, line 14-33, which points at the lateral space in between adjacent cavities.

The invention of claim 1 provides a relatively compact device by placing the drive member of the mold segments in the lateral space in between adjacent cavities. Although this was believed to compromise the packing density, by joining the operation of a single driving member to wall segments of different cavities, the invention achieves a compact structure without adversely affecting the packing density substantially. Moving base plate upward, cylinders 11 and move upward allowing pins 10 to drive segments 5 apart.

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the German reference DE 197 06 797 or the equivalent US patent to Kourtoglou (6,324,819) in view of Schweigert et al. (6,099,785).

Fig. 3 of Kourtoglou shows how two mold halves 9 and 10, which together form a plurality of cavities, are separated. Note the sides of the mold slide on slide rails 15 and guides 16. There is no vertical motion involved in separating the two halves of the mold.

In addition, Kourtoglou describes a single row of cavities without any lateral space between adjacent cavities which can accommodate a common driving element. There is no teaching or suggestion in Kourtoglou to place a common driving element in a lateral space between cavities.


Schweigert does not remedy the defects of Kourtoglou. Schweigert is directed to the function of a single mold cavity which utilizes a mold having several segments as walls. Schweigert does not teach or suggest how such a mold could operate with a plurality of cavities and a common drive element.

It is unclear how Kourtoglou could be modified to accommodate the mold of Schweigert since Kourtoglou utilizes a slide mechanism to separate two halves of a mold having a row of cavities. Moreover, even if Kourtoglou could be modified, one skilled in the art would not be directed to a mold device having a common driving element in a lateral space between cavities as required in instant claim 1. Withdrawal of the instant rejection is requested.

#### CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, withdrawal of the instant rejections and issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Susan A. Wolffe  
Reg. No. 33,568

Date: 8/30/04

Banner & Witcoff, Ltd.  
1001 G Street, N.W.  
Washington, D. C. 20001-4597  
(202) 508-9100